

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the Office action of 29 Dec 2003, designated FINAL. Claims 1-19 are in the case, none as yet allowed.

35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 5, 7-8, and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Applicants have amended claims 5, 7, and 11 to correct the antecedent basis, and claim 8 depends from claim 7.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Salas et al., U.S. Patent 6,314,408.

Applicants have amended the independent claims to clarify that what applicants are claiming is a system or

method for creating a place type.

The Examiner refers to Salas et al. at Col. 4, lines 6-24 and Col.7, lines 4-9, which teaches a template for creating pages of an eRoom, or collaboration space.

In order to sustain a 102 rejection of applicants claims, it would be necessary that Salas et al. teach, inter alia, that the template be created from an eRoom. This is not the case. The Salas et al. manner of creating the template is taught at Col. 6, lines 25ff in connection with Figure 5. A page builder is used to create the template. There is no teaching that the input to the page builder, or that the resulting template, is provided by or created from a previously existing eRoom (in Salas et al. terminology) or place (in applicants' terminology).

This distinction is brought out clearly in the claims. For example, in claim 1, "saving said first place as a place type from which other places may be created" is not taught by Salas et al. Applicants amendment to the preamble of claims is made to clarify that the invention is directed to the creation of the place type, and not just to the creation of new places from a place type. This distinction over

Salas et al. was in the claims prior to this amendment, and is merely clarified by the current amendment to the preamble.

Applicants request that rejection of claims 1-19 over Salas et al. be reconsidered in light of the above comments, and that these claims be allowed.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered to place the application in condition for allowance, and the case passed to issue with claims 1-19, or else entered as placing the claims in better condition for purpose of appeal.

The Application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action by the Examiner is urged. Should differences remain, however, which do not place one/more of the remaining claims in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to phone the undersigned at the number provided below for the purpose of providing constructive

assistance and suggestions in accordance with M.P.E.P.
Sections 707.02(j) and 707.03 in order that allowable claims
can be presented, thereby placing the Application in
condition for allowance without further proceedings being
necessary.

Sincerely,

Julio Estrada

By


Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 19 Feb 2004

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827

Phone: (607) 687-9913
Fax: (607) 687-7848